

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ROBERT STURTEVANT,

Plaintiffs,

v.

XEROX COMMERCIAL SOLUTIONS, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. C16-1158RSM

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
DISMISS AND COMPEL ARBITRATION

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Compel Arbitration. Dkt. #7. Defendant argues that Plaintiff signed an agreement that arbitration would be the exclusive method of resolving most legal issues, and therefore this Court lacks jurisdiction to hear his claims. *Id.* Plaintiff opposes the motion, primarily arguing that he never entered into such an agreement. Dkt. #9. For the reasons discussed below, the Court now finds Plaintiff's arguments contrary to the evidence in the record and GRANTS Defendant's motion.

**II. BACKGROUND**

On June 27, 2016, Plaintiff Robert Sturtevant served a Summons and Complaint against Defendant, his former employer. Dkt. #1 at ¶ 1 and Ex. 1 thereto. In his Complaint, Plaintiff alleges three causes of action: (1) discrimination under Washington's Law Against Discrimination ("WLAD"); (2) retaliation under the WLAD; and (3) failure to accommodate

1 under the WLAD. Dkt. #1, Ex. 1 at ¶¶ 3.2 to 3.14. The Complaint reflected that the lawsuit  
2 was to proceed in King County Superior Court; however, it does not appear that the lawsuit  
3 was ever filed in that Court. *See* Dkt. #8. In any event, on July 27, 2016, Defendant removed  
4 the matter to this Court. Dkt. #1.

5       Plaintiff's allegations arise out of his former employment with Defendant. On or about  
6 September 11, 2008, Plaintiff applied for employment with Affiliated Computer Services  
7 ("ACS"). Dkt. #7, Ex. A at ¶ 13. He applied using ACS's electronic application process. *Id.*  
8 That process allowed applicants to electronically complete, review and sign documents. *Id.* at ¶  
9 14. Likewise, it allowed new hires to electronically review and sign documents. *Id.* In order  
10 to utilize the process, applicants were required to create an account with a private login name  
11 and password. *Id.* at ¶ 15. As part of his application process, Plaintiff provided his personal  
12 information, and electronically agreed to various company policies, including a consent to be  
13 bound by a Dispute Resolution Plan ("DRP"). *Id.* at ¶¶ 16-17 and Ex. A-3. That DRP  
14 included a provision that the plan provided the exclusive means for resolving disputes relating  
15 to the terms and conditions of employment. *Id.* Plaintiff also electronically signed a Pre-  
16 Employment Consent to Alcohol/Drug Screening and an Agreement not to Use Former  
17 Employers' Confidential or Trade Secret Information, the day before. Dkt. #11, Ex. A at ¶¶ 7-  
18 8 and Ex. A-9 thereto.

19       On or around October 2008, Plaintiff was hired by Affiliated Computer Services  
20 ("ACS") as a supervisor in King County, WA. Dkt. #1-1 at ¶ 2.2. On October 15, 2008, using  
21 the same personal login name and password, Plaintiff electronically signed seven other  
22 documents, including a direct deposit form and acknowledgement of the Employee Guidebook.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 *Id.* and Dkt. #7, Ex. A at ¶ 21 and Ex. A-6 thereto. The Employee Guidebook also referenced  
2 the DRP. Dkt. #7, Ex. A at ¶ 21 and Ex. A-7 thereto.

3 Plaintiff was subsequently promoted to Operations Manager. Dkt. #1-1 at ¶ 2.2.

4 In 2010, Defendant Xerox Commercial Solutions, LLC (“XCS”) merged with ACS. *Id.*  
5 at ¶ 2.3.

6 Plaintiff was subsequently promoted to Strategic Business Unit Manager. *Id.* at ¶ 2.4.

7  
8 On September 14, 2012, Defendant sent an email notification regarding revisions to the  
9 DRP. Dkt. #7, Ex. A. at ¶ 18. The email was sent to Plaintiff at his business email address. It  
10 included a hyperlink to the Revised DRP. *Id.* at Ex. A-4. XCS utilized a computer program to  
11 track employee receipt of the email. *Id.* at ¶ 19. That program reflects that Plaintiff opened the  
12 email on September 27, 2012. *Id.* at ¶ 19 and Ex. A-5 thereto. The email stated, “by  
13 continuing your employment with [Defendant] after the Effective Date you are accepting and  
14 consenting to be bound by the revised DRP.” Dkt. #7, Ex. A at ¶ 19 and Ex. A-5 thereto.  
15

16 On May 8, 2013, Plaintiff completed a training entitled “Dispute Resolution Plan Rules  
17 (September 2012 revision)”. Dkt. #11-1 at and Ex. A-11 thereto. As part of the training,  
18 Plaintiff was asked to confirm that he reviewed the course material for the presentation. That  
19 course material contained the revised DRP and a version of the email notice that had been sent  
20 in September of 2012. *Id.* at Ex. A-12.  
21

22 On or about March 17, 2015, Plaintiff suffered a debilitating illness. Dkt. #1-1 at ¶ 2.5.  
23 A couple of days later, he collapsed at work and received emergency medical attention. *Id.* at ¶  
24 ¶ 2.7-2.8. On March 24, 2015, Plaintiff requested medical leave for March 26, 2015. *Id.* at ¶  
25 2.9. The request was denied. *Id.* at ¶ 2.10. On March 25, 2016, Defendant terminated  
26 Plaintiff’s employment. *Id.* at ¶ 2.11. The instant lawsuit followed.  
27  
28

1 After Defendant removed the action to this Court, Defendant moved to dismiss  
2 Plaintiff's claims and compel arbitration. Dkt. #7. Defendant argues that Plaintiff accepted the  
3 Xerox DRP, which clearly notified him that "virtually all legal Disputes (as defined in the  
4 DRP) concerning your employment, the terms and conditions of your employment and/or your  
5 separation from employment are subject to final and binding resolution exclusively by  
6 arbitration." Dkt. #7, Ex. A-4. Plaintiff opposes the motion, stating that he never signed an  
7 arbitration agreement during his employment, or made any agreement to be bound by the  
8 Revised DRP. Dkt. #10 at ¶¶ 9-10 [sic].

### 10 III. DISCUSSION

#### 11 A. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike

12 As an initial matter, the Court addresses Plaintiff's motion to strike. Plaintiff has  
13 moved to strike the Declaration of Shirley Pierce filed in support of Defendant's motion. Dkt.  
14 #9 at 3. Plaintiff argues that Ms. Pierce cannot properly authenticate the records attached to her  
15 Declaration because she has no actual knowledge of either Plaintiff's agreement to the DRP or  
16 the company's operations at the time Defendant initially signed the agreement. *Id.* Plaintiff's  
17 motion is DENIED.

18 Ms. Pierce is the Vice-President of Human Resources for Xerox Business Services,  
19 LLC ("XBS"), and has been employed in that role since August of 2013. Dkt. #7, Ex. A at ¶ 2.  
20 XBS is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Xerox Corporation. *Id.* at ¶ 3. XBS was formerly known  
21 as ACS. *Id.* at ¶ 4. Xerox Commercial Solutions, LLC, the Defendant in this action, is a  
22 wholly owned subsidiary of XBS. *Id.* at ¶ 5. In her position, Ms. Pierce has access to the  
23 business and personnel records of current and former employees of XBS and its subsidiaries,  
24 including XCS. Dkt. #7, Ex. A at ¶ 7.

1 Courts in the Ninth Circuit have long found that the Declaration of a records custodian  
2 may satisfy person knowledge requirements for business records as evidence. *See Washington*  
3 *Cent. R.R. Co., Inc. v. Nat'l Mediation Bd.*, 830 F. Supp. 1343, 1352–53 (E.D. Wash.1993);  
4 *Edwards v. Toys 'R Us*, 527 F.Supp.2d 1197, 1201 (C.D. Cal.2007) (citing *In re Kaypro*, 218  
5 F.3d 1070, 1075 (9th Cir.2000) (“Personal knowledge may be inferred from a declarant’s  
6 position.”). Indeed, “personal knowledge can come from review of the contents of files and  
7 records.” *Washington Cent. R.R. Co.*, 830 F. Supp. at 152-53. Washington State courts have  
8 found the same. *See Barkley v. GreenPoint Mortg. Funding, Inc.*, 190 Wn. App. 58, 67, 358  
9 P.3d 1204 (2015).

11 Accordingly, the Court finds Ms. Pierce’s Declaration and Supplemental Declaration  
12 appropriate and declines to strike them or the Exhibits attached thereto.

#### 14 **B. Agreement Between the Parties**

15 The Court next addresses whether there is a binding agreement between Plaintiff and  
16 Defendant to exclusively use arbitration to resolve Plaintiff’s employment complaints. Plaintiff  
17 argues that there is a genuine issue of material fact as to whether he signed the arbitration  
18 agreement under Washington law, and therefore that question must be submitted to a jury in  
19 this Court for resolution. Dkt. #9 at 4-8. Specifically, he argues that there is no valid  
20 agreement under Washington law, Defendant has presented no evidence of an agreement  
21 between the parties, and a new agreement was never created in 2012 binding Plaintiff. *Id.* For  
22 the reasons discussed herein, the Court disagrees.

25 Plaintiff first argues that there was no mutual assent to the DRP when Mr. Sturtevant  
26 began employment, and therefore he never agreed to arbitration. Dkt. #9 at 5-6. Plaintiff relies  
27 on *Neuson v. Macy’s Dept. Stores, Inc.*, 160 Wn. App. 786, 796, 249 P.3d 1054 (2011), for the  
28

1 proposition that an e-signature on an arbitration agreement is not reliable when the employer  
2 had access to the employee's identifying information. Dkt. #9 at 5. Plaintiff's argument is  
3 misguided.

4       *Neuson* involved an in-house program that Macy's had implemented to resolve disputes.  
5 *Id.* at 789. Employees had to affirmatively opt out of arbitration to avoid being bound to  
6 arbitrate. Macy's produced declarations that it mailed the in-house program materials and  
7 election forms to the employee, who denied receiving them by mail. The Spokane Superior  
8 Court found that Macy's had made a necessary showing to establish the presumption of mailing  
9 and that the employee failed to opt out of the program, and then ordered arbitration. *Id.* at 789-  
10 91. On appeal, the Washington State Court of Appeals reversed and remanded. *Id.* at 797.  
11 The Court of Appeals discussed "the mailbox rule" at length, and agreed that Macy's had made  
12 the requisite showing for a presumption of mailing. *Id.* at 793. Further, the court agreed that  
13 the Declarations supported the trial court's findings, but ultimately found that the trial court  
14 was not privileged to weigh the evidence in ruling on this summary proceeding. The court of  
15 appeals determined that the employee had met her burden to produce sufficient evidence to  
16 rebut the presumption that the employer mailed and she received the materials necessary to opt  
17 out of the in-house arbitration program. Thus, questions of fact existed for the trier of fact. *Id.*  
18 at 793-97.

19       The case is distinguishable from the instant matter. Indeed, in *Neuson* there was no  
20 dispute about the electronic process used to verify notice of the arbitration program. Rather,  
21 this was a dispute about whether the Plaintiff has received hard copy forms in the mail that  
22 would have allowed her to opt out of the program. The court of appeals explained:

23               Macy's gives each new employee a Solutions InSTORE brochure and an  
24 election form. The new employee then uses a computer terminal to

1 complete the majority of the new hire paperwork electronically. The  
2 electronic paperwork includes an acknowledgment form that the employee  
3 received the Solutions InSTORE brochure and understands her opportunity  
4 to decline arbitration. The employee reads and signs each document  
5 electronically using her Social Security number, month and day of birth,  
6 and zip code. Macy's computer program uses that personal information to  
7 generate an electronic signature unique to that employee. Once the  
8 employee electronically signs a document, the computer then generates a  
9 confirmation page that lists the employee's name, the store site, the name of  
10 the form signed, and the date and time the employee signed it. All  
11 completed new hire paperwork is stored in on-line personnel files. It is also  
12 stored in a hard copy file. The Northtown Macy's human resources  
13 assistant, Sarah Allie, recalled asking Ms. Neuson to complete new hire  
14 paperwork. And Ms. Neuson's employee file includes a document  
15 confirming that she signed the acknowledgment form, which shows she  
16 received the Solutions InSTORE brochure and understood she had 30 days  
17 to opt out of arbitration.

18 ...

19 We, then, turn to the evidence supporting Ms. Neuson's position that she  
20 did not receive an opt-out form and, therefore, could not opt out of  
21 arbitration.

22 Ms. Neuson lived at three separate addresses while working at the  
23 Silverdale Macy's. She swore that an attorney advised her to opt out of  
24 arbitration when in Silverdale and that she did so. . . . But she ultimately  
25 denies by sworn affidavit that Macy's gave her the documents necessary to  
26 opt out of the Solutions InSTORE arbitration provision.

27 Ms. Neuson had a 30-day break in employment between the Macy's in  
28 Silverdale and the Northtown Macy's in Spokane. But she says she was  
treated as a new hire by the Northtown Macy's. She claims that break in  
service and her treatment as a new hire voids whatever efforts Macy's might  
have made to notify her in Silverdale of the opportunity to opt out of  
arbitration. Macy's responds there must be a 60-day break in service to  
trigger its obligation to again send the opt-out materials to an employee but  
that it did so anyway.

...

The resolution of the underlying factual dispute here is complicated by the  
use of an electronic signature. This signature is essential to Macy's position  
that Ms. Neuson received the materials and form necessary to opt out of  
arbitration. It is not a signature in the traditional sense but rather a string of  
numbers consisting of an employee's Social Security number, birth date,

1 and zip code. The information in Ms. Neuson's electronic signature is  
2 unique to her, and Macy's urges that it is sufficient to show that Ms.  
3 Neuson received the opt-out form. We find evidence that the Northtown  
4 Macy's has a procedure and that its procedure was followed, but we do not  
5 find evidence of how or why the information on this electronic signature  
6 would be unavailable to anyone other than Ms. Neuson and, ultimately, why  
7 it is the same as or better than a traditional signature.

8 *Neuson*, 160 Wn. App. at 793-96.

9 This last portion of the court's opinion is critical, because that is where Mr. Sturtevant  
10 points in support of his argument in the instant matter. However, the reason that the Court  
11 discussed the "complication" of the electronic signature was because Ms. Neuson had argued  
12 "that the paperwork could have been completed and backdated by someone other than her  
13 because the individual forms used her maiden name and one form referred to a driver's license  
14 number that was not issued to her until [after her start date]." *Neuson*, 160 Wn. App. at 791.  
15 As a result, the Court found that there was a question of fact as to whether she received the opt-  
16 out form.

17 Mr. Sturtevant has made no similar arguments in the instant matter. He does not claim  
18 that his company email address has changed over time, nor does he assert that he did not  
19 receive the other forms he reviewed and signed electronically on the same dates as he  
20 acknowledged the DRP, or that his signature does not appear on such forms. In fact, as  
21 Defendant notes, to make such an assertion would beg the question of how he was hired in the  
22 first place. *See* Dkt. #11 at 9-10. Moreover, Mr. Sturtevant has presented no evidence to  
23 support his bald assertion that he did not agree to an arbitration agreement, that he did not  
24 consent electronically to such an agreement, or that he did not open his email providing notice  
25 of the agreement. *See* Dkt. #10. He has simply failed to refute the evidence in this record  
26 demonstrating his receipt and review of the DRP.  
27  
28



1 In addition, the Court rejects Plaintiff's argument that there is no agreement between  
2 Plaintiff and Defendant because Defendant failed to provide evidence that it acquired all  
3 employment contracts of ACS at the time it merged with Xerox. *See* Dkt. #9 at 6-7. Defendant  
4 provides the details of the acquisition through Ms. Pierce. Dkt. #7, Ex. A at ¶¶ 3-6. Further,  
5 Plaintiff fails to provide any legal support for his argument.  
6

7 Likewise, Plaintiff's argument that he did not receive or agree to the 2012 Amended  
8 DRP fails for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the original DRP. Moreover,  
9 Plaintiff fails to acknowledge the evidence in the record that he completed a training on the  
10 amendment on May 8, 2013. For all of these reasons, the Court finds that there was an  
11 agreement to arbitrate between Plaintiff and Defendant.  
12

### 13 **C. Federal Arbitration Act**

14 Plaintiff does not dispute that the original and amended DRP are governed by the  
15 Federal Arbitration Act ("FAA"). Instead, he has argued only that an agreement does not exist  
16 between these parties. *See* Dkt. #11. Under Local Civil Rule 7, "[e]xcept for motions for  
17 summary judgment, if a party fails to file papers in opposition to a motion, such failure may be  
18 considered by the court as an admission that the motion has merit." LCR 7(b)(2). The Court  
19 considers Plaintiff's failure to respond as such an admission on this motion.  
20

21 Further, the Court has reviewed Defendant's legal arguments pertaining to the FAA and  
22 motions to compel thereunder, and agrees that the original and amended DRP are governed by  
23 the FAA, and that Plaintiff should be compelled to arbitrate. *See* Dkt. #7 at 9-11.  
24

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

**IV. CONCLUSION**

Having reviewed Defendant's motion, Plaintiff's opposition thereto, Defendant's reply, and the Declarations and Exhibits in support thereof, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

1. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss and Compel Arbitration (Dkt. #7) is GRANTED.
2. All of Plaintiff's claims against Xerox Commercial Solutions, LLC are hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE, and they shall be resolved in accordance with the Xerox Business Services Dispute Resolution Plan.
3. This matter is now CLOSED.

DATED this 19 day of September, 2016.



RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE